

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE J		PAGE OF PAGES 1   6	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 24-May-2004		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. W68MD9-4118-3270		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY USA ENGINEER DISTRICT, SEATTLE ATTN: CENWS-CT 4735 EAST MARGINAL WAY SOUTH SEATTLE WA 98134-2329		CODE W912DW		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) USA ENGINEER DISTRICT, SEATTLE SCOTT BRITT PH:206-764-3517 FAX: 206-764-6817 SCOTT.W.BRITT@US.ARMY.MIL SEATTLE WA		CODE W912DW	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)				X		9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. W912DW-04-Q-0094	
				X		9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 19-May-2004	
						10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
						10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE		FACILITY CODE					
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended.  Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.							
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)							
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.							
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.							
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).							
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:							
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)							
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.							
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) See Continuation Page							
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.							
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)				16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)			
				TEL: _____ EMAIL: _____			
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR  _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		15C. DATE SIGNED		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. DATE SIGNED 24-May-2004	

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

**The following items are applicable to this modification:**

MODIFICATION DESCRIPTION

1. The following have been modified:
  - a. EVALUATION FACTORS: paragraph 9 Contract Pre-Award Survey - Banking Information of Firm is added
  - b. Drawing #2 Visitor Center is deleted
2. There are no further changes as a result of this modification.

ATTACHMENT:

EVALUATION FACTORS

## EVALUATION FACTORS

### 1. Evaluation Factors- Simplified Acquisition

This request for quotation contains Evaluation Factors for the services identified herein. The Government reserves the right to make an award that is determined to be the most advantageous using the Best Value Evaluation Factors of technical and past performance information and cost (price). Technical and past performance information is significantly more important than cost (price). To be considered for award, proposals/quotes shall conform to the terms and conditions contained in this solicitation.

### 2. Selection Board:

The Contracting Officer may establish a selection board to conduct an evaluation of each proposal received in response to this solicitation. The evaluation will be based exclusively on the merits and content of the quote. The Board will not consider any information incorporated by reference or otherwise referred to. The individual ratings provided by the references will be used by the Board to determine an overall rating, using the categories: green, yellow-green, yellow, and red.

### 3. Evaluation Factors: ratings are evaluated using the following, in descending order of importance:

#### 3.1. Technical/Past Performance (see paragraph 6)

Each firm must complete the attached form that inquires about the firm's performance of custodial services similar to the scope of work identified herein. This information is necessary to provide a rating of the firm's technical and past performance information.

#### 3.2. Price:

Quote prices are secondary to the technical factors. Other than to determine price reasonableness, there will be no comparison of quote prices exclusive of technical/past performance information. The firm's quote price for this project is to reflect all costs associated with the work requirements, including option periods.

### 4. Best Value Analysis:

The Government is primarily concerned with making award to the contractor who exhibits superior past performance/experience. Utilization of the tradeoff process of evaluation is used to determining the best value to the Government. The tradeoff process permits tradeoffs among price and non-price factors and allows the government to consider award to other than the lowest priced offeror. Be advised that greater consideration is given to the evaluation of technical expertise and past performance rather than price. The highest past performance rating is "green" and the offer in that category is eligible for award. However, in the case of more than one "green" rated offeror, price becomes the determining factor of award. In the case that there are no "green" rated offerors, or that the "green" rated offer's price is less than fair and reasonable, the award will be determined using the "yellow-green" category. Likewise, the "yellow" category will be used if there are no "yellow-green" competitors. Contractors with "red" ratings are not eligible for award. It is the intent of the Government to make award based upon initial offers, without further discussions or additional information.

### 5. Basis of Award:

Award shall be made to a higher rated offeror and may be awarded to a higher priced offeror if the offer is sufficiently more advantageous to the Government, inasmuch, to justify the payment of a higher price. The degree of importance of price as a factor shall become more important when technical expertise/past performance of more than one firm is relatively equal in merit. Prices quoted for this project reflects all cost associated with the work required to complete the tasks identified in the Scope of Work and will be evaluated to reflect the Contractor's understanding of the project requirements, as well as the potential to provide the Best Value (price reasonableness)

6. Technical Evaluation Submittals:

6.1. Complete and return the information above with your quote

Describe the firm's current or last project that is similar to the Statement of Work project description:

---

---

---

---

---

---

Start Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Completion Date (if complete): \_\_\_\_\_

Provide the following information of a POC knowledgeable of the project listed, above:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Have you ever failed to complete work awarded to you? If so, where and why?

---

---

---

---

---

---

6.2. Provide a copy of your firm's QC plan, pursuant to paragraph 4.1 of the Statement of Work. This may be a draft, however, a final copy is necessary after award and prior to the start of work. At a minimum, an acceptable QC plan addresses paragraph 2 of the SOW – Service Delivery Summary. Describe how the work shall be accomplished successfully and when the periodic (quarterly) services shall occur. Provide a list of contractor-owned cleaning equipment and give a brief overview of the environmental friendliness of the cleaning supplies.

6.3. Provide a Project Management Plan. An acceptable PMP includes the firm's management structure (organization chart) and a resume of the project QC and PM (if this is the same person, one resume suffices.) This resume should describe the person's experience, including the number of years performing services similar to those in the SOW. Include at least 2 projects of similar scope and a POC for each.

7. The Government will call at the POC, in 6.1 and ask the following questions:

- a. **QUALITY OF SERVICE PROVIDED:** Rate the contractor's compliance with project requirements and the ability of the contractor to provide quality service and a professional attitude.
- b. **TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE:** Rate the contractor's ability to adhere to schedules with no compromise of quality performance.
- c. **TIMELINESS OF CORRECTIVE ACTIONS:** Rate the contractor's prompt, satisfactory resolution of problems. If there have been no problems, how would you expect the contractor to perform?

- d. **CUSTOMER SATISFACTION:** Rate the overall satisfaction with the contractor's performance. Consider the following: Would you work with this contractor again? Would you recommend hiring this contractor?

The response to each of these questions shall be one of the following:  
Excellent, Good, Acceptable, Poor, or Unsatisfactory

8. Evaluation grading:

- e. Highest Rating – **Green:**  
Acceptable Project Management Plan  
Acceptable QC plan  
No work failures  
All Excellent reference comments
- f. Second Highest Rating - **Yellow-Green:**  
Acceptable Project Management Plan  
Acceptable QC Plan  
No work failures  
No Acceptable, Poor, or Unsatisfactory comments
- g. Third Highest Rating - **Yellow:**  
Acceptable Management Plan  
Acceptable QC Plan  
\*No more than 1 justified work failure  
No Acceptable, Poor, or Unsatisfactory comments  
  
\*Justification documentation signed by the Project Manager required
- h. Fourth Highest Rating - **Red:**  
**IF THE CONTRACTOR HAS ANY OF THE FOLLOWING  
A RED RATING IS GIVEN**  
Less than acceptable QC plan  
Less than acceptable Project Management Plan  
More than 1 work failure (regardless of justification)  
1 or more Poor or Unsatisfactory comments  
NOTE: A red rating is unacceptable - No award shall be made to a red-rated firm.

9. Contract Pre-Award Survey - Banking Information of Firm

As a condition of award, The US Army Corps of Engineers will conduct a Pre-Award Survey of the most highly-rated firm to determine responsibility. Please provide the following contact information with your quote:

- i. Name of Bank and Branch \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- j. Personal Banker \_\_\_\_\_
- k. Telephone Number \_\_\_\_\_
- l. Fax Number \_\_\_\_\_

(End of Summary of Changes)